



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/707,143

11/24/2003

Damian Arregui

D/A2187

1142

25453

7590

03/24/2008

PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER

XEROX CORPORATION

100 CLINTON AVE., SOUTH, XEROX SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER

LIU, LIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2145

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/707,143	Applicant(s) ARREGUI ET AL.	
	Examiner LIN LIU	Art Unit 2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed on 12/0/2007.

Claims 1-20 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

4. Applicant has amended these claims to include the additional limitation: "wherein the plurality of operating behaviors are "very reliable," "reliable," "unreliable," and "very unreliable." ", which is not presently supported by the specification, the actual disclosure of the specification (page 29, paragraph 61) states: "... the repositories or sources can be classified as having *one of a predefined number of operating behaviors* (e.g., very reliable, reliable, unreliable, and very unreliable)." Therefore, for the purpose of examination, the examiner treats the newly added limitation as: "wherein one of the plurality of operating behaviors is selected from: "very reliable," "reliable," "unreliable," and "very unreliable."" . Applicant is advised to further clarify these claims if disagree.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims **1-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (b) as being anticipated by **Arregui et al. (EP 1111518 A1)**.

With respect to **claim 1**, Arregui teaches a document management system, comprising:

one or more document repositories for storing documents (Arregui, fig. 1 and page 3, paragraph 17, noted the document repositories 12);

a document notification and delivery service (DNDS) for detecting documents pertaining to subjects of interest that are stored in the document repositories (Arregui, fig. 1, page 2 paragraph 6 and page 3, paragraph 17, noted the system 10); and

a plurality of workflow modules subscribing to the DNDS to receive documents identified that pertain to one or more subscribed subjects of interest (Arregui, fig. 1 and page 4, paragraphs 21 and 23, noted the printer 54, document repository 55 and request 57 from users subscribe to system 10); at least two workflow modules producing one or more documents that are published to one or more of the document repositories (Arregui, fig. 1 and page 4, paragraph 21);

wherein a first workflow module publishes to one of the document repositories a first document which is detected by the DNDS and which pertains to at least one subscribed subject of interest of a second workflow module (Arregui, fig. 1 and page 4, paragraphs 21-22);

wherein subsequent to the publication of the first document by the DNDS to the one of the document repositories, the DNDS delivers the first document to the second workflow module that does not require the first workflow module to produce a second document (Arregui, fig. 1 and page 4, paragraph 23); and

wherein one of the at least two workflow modules is associated with a user that performs one or more tasks to produce the one or more documents (Arregui: page 4, paragraph 23, noted that the user can choose a delivery media to subscribe for the document of interest, such as email, fax or printer).

With respect to **claim 2**, Arregui teaches the document management system according to claim 1, further comprising notification targets for subscribing to subjects at the DNDS to receive alerts when documents are identified that pertain to one or more subscribed subjects of interest (Arregui, page 1, paragraph 6 and page 3, paragraph 17).

With respect to **claim 3**, Arregui teaches the document management system according to claim 1, wherein one of the plurality of workflow modules is one of a web service (Arregui, page 3, paragraph 13) and a process associated with a user that performs one or more tasks to produce the one or more documents (Arregui: page 4,

paragraph 23, noted that user can choose the delivery media to subscribe for the document of interest.).

With respect to **claim 4**, Arregui teaches the document management system according to claim 1, wherein the DNDS processes the first document before delivering it to the second workflow module (Arregui, page 3, paragraph 17, noted that document transformation is provided to transform documents to a desired format.).

With respect to **claim 5**, Arregui teaches the document management system according to claim 4, wherein the DNDS processes the first document by performing one of summarization, enrichment, and translation (Arregui, page 3, paragraph 17, noted that document transformation is provided to transform documents to a desired format.).

With respect to **claim 6**, Arregui teaches the document management system according to claim 1, wherein the DNDS further comprises means for:

(a) monitoring events and attributes concerning detected documents for which notification or delivery are performed (Arregui, abstract and page 4, paragraphs 22 and 24); and

(b) using the monitored events and attributes to identify ones of the detected documents as highly rated documents for notification to users not originally subscribed to the subject of interest for which the notification or delivery is performed (Arregui, page 4, paragraph 22).

With respect to **claim 7**, Arregui teaches the document management system according to claim 1, wherein the DNDS further comprises:

a plurality of document repositories with each being adapted to store a plurality of documents (Arregui, fig. 1 and page 3, paragraph 17, noted the document repositories);

a subject directory for representing subjects of the plurality of documents in the plurality of document repositories (Arregui, fig. 1, and page 3, paragraph 17, noted the subject directory 48);

a profile directory for representing a plurality of users accounts, with each user account subscribing to at least one subject of interest (Arregui, fig. 1, and page 3, paragraph 19, noted the profile directory 18);

a subject refinement module for (Arregui, fig. 1, and page 3, paragraph 19):

monitoring document notifications and delivery requests associated with the document notifications to provide subject refinement data; and using the subject refinement data to refine subjects in the subject directory (Arregui, page 3, paragraphs 13-14 and 19, noted that user can refine the subjects via interface 15).

With respect to **claim 8**, Arregui teaches the document management system according to claim 1, wherein the DNDs further comprises:

a plurality of document repositories with each being adapted to store a plurality of documents (Arregui, fig. 1 and page 3, paragraph 17, noted the document repositories);

a subject directory for representing subjects of the plurality of documents in the plurality of document repositories (Arregui, fig. 1, and page 3, paragraph 17, noted the subject directory 48);

a profile directory for representing a plurality of users accounts with each user account subscribing to at least one subject of interest (Arregui, fig. 1, and page 3, paragraphs 17 & 19);

a profile refinement module (Arregui, fig. 1, and page 3, paragraph 19) for:
monitoring frequency of user delivery requests for document notifications concerning each subscribed subject of interest to provide profile refinement data (Arregui, page 3, paragraphs 13-14 and 19); and

using the profile refinement data to refine user preferences for document notification and delivery (Arregui, pages 3-4, paragraphs 19-20, noted that user can change the profile via interface 15 and notification method).

With respect to **claim 9**, Arregui teaches the document management system according to claim 1, wherein the DNDs further comprises a failure recovery module for:
recording component failure information (Arregui, page 8, paragraph 50, table 2);
assigning each of the document repositories according to one of a plurality of operating behaviors using the component failure information (Arregui, page 8, paragraph 50); and

determining appropriate action to take in response to component identified failures using the operating behavior assigned to the document repository to which the component is associated (Arregui, page 8, paragraph 50, noted the automatic document transformations before delivering the document);

wherein one of the plurality of operating behaviors is selected from: "very reliable," "reliable," "unreliable," and "very unreliable" (Arregui: page 8, paragraph 50 and table 2).

In regard to **claims 10-18**, the limitations of these claims are substantially the same as those in claims 1-9, but rather in method form. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claims 1-8 is used to reject claims 10-18. By this rationale **claims 10-18** are rejected.

In regard to **claims 19-20**, the limitations of these claims are substantially the same as those in claims 1-2, but rather in method form. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claims 1-2 is used to reject claims 19-20. By this rationale **claims 19-20** are rejected.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 12/07/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In response to applicant's argument that Arregui fails to teach or suggest the limitation: "wherein one of the at least two workflow modules is associated with a user that performs one or more tasks to produce the one or more documents". The office respectfully disagrees. The newly added limitation only requires that one of the at least two workflow modules to be "associated or involved" with a user. Similarly, in the case of Arregui, the user can choose the

delivery medium to subscribe for the document of interest such as email, fax or printer (Arregui: page 5, paragraph 23).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lin Liu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1447.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. L./
/Lin Liu/

Examiner, Art Unit 2145

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145